

Dear Jim,

3/2/75

I was down to a couple of letters on top of the last writing - had almost cleared the stack except for an accumulation of filing - when yesterday morning I learned that the cabin on our place had again been vandalized. So, despite the fact that I've gotten the first cold in so many years I can't remember the last one, I had to backpack all that remained over to the house, where there isn't room for it. Especially not about eight 16-foot boards. It loused up yesterday and today, if it doesn't snow, as predicted, the coming of Deep Throat Jr. (M) will. If I didn't have doubts from the contents I would have from the fact that he had been in touch with me before, intended to be by phone, and gave no identification. Overacted.

From Ian a London Times 2/25 story quoting Miles Copeland extensively and in a way that should make Sy Hersh a story. Copeland's on the appearance of his book in England. He quotes unnamed CIA sources as Dulles said it in the transcript about lying to the official investigators. The copy not fit for copying, I've suggested to JL that he get one in DC. If he does I'll send you a copy.

Last night I felt so punk I just read. Thanks for the clips with your 2/21. And I finished the Chameleon file, "Leigh James." I had read most of it on the train to and from NYC. I'm convinced it is Hunt or the CIA had a second propagandist-novelist on the staff. A house novelist is an interesting spook switch we've never discussed. There was more than enough without these to so designate Hunt, and that makes interesting whether or not there was another charter violation: propaganda. I'm not going to read enough of his trash for a definitive determination, but I think he has a name for each type of writing, meaning by subject. This one justifies political assassination - of Castro. It appears to be timed to the capture of one of the bands that was publicized by Castro on TV.

Ldl does get LHJ but hasn't had time to look at it. She'll save the Pat piece, thanks. The UPI story quotes comment on the inherently incredible, so I'm anxious to read the whole thing. The Enquirer piece was more interesting. I'll bet the unidentified Nixon friend was Gene Pope, the Nixonian owner of the rag. The accompanying picture is particularly appropriate for what you called "wall-to-wall heart throbs." His mouth is full of alum, her face set by Central Castings. and neither is looking at the other.

This and what it says of Julia reminds me of what I've never told you. In F-U you may remember the young woman I sent to see the British lawyer, Eugene, to get the Ray extradition documents. I didn't name her. When she returned to US she was offered a WH job and she needed any job she could get. I told her it would be unwise to be in touch again when she was approved. She has risen and is the chip off the old block (female variant) secretary.

Gregory and Grodin are scheduled for the ABC weekly show aired in the East at 11:30 p.m. Thursday. My campaign appears to have had some success - if they keep their words. They'll stick to what I've been saying when they discuss Z. That can be effective.

JL got so wrapped up in the show I did Thursday vs Willens and Jones Harris that he forgot to tend the recorders. He had two going, his and Bud's. The segments we did ran 45 minutes so he missed the more important and I'm sure not audience recognized admissions I got from Willens! Worse - Mark and you were SO right about the subminterature machines! That Sony TC 55 was defective on purchase and I never had a chance to find out because I never dreamed it would have to be tested. The woman I'd interviewed had her own set up, so I did not then use the machine. When I found out that Lesar had borrowed Bud's I gave him the tapes to dub (on King). And so, when I gave the two women who went to the studio that machine to use (its smaller size was a distinct advantage in carrying it in a slim portfolio with files and two books) I was confident that with a C120 I'd get it all. In fact it didn't run at all and the tape was good, the batteries fresh, and dead when the 45 minutes were over. At home I tried it with AC and it ran forward but would not rewind. So, I wrote Grodin to ask if he'd ask the store with which he deals and where I'd gotten such a great discount if a) they'd take it back instead of me being without the machine while Sony makes up its mind to repair or replace and b) if they'll let me have the TV45 instead. It is not that I don't know the larger machines can't give trouble. Lesar has not used his TC40A much and it went bad and he's never been able to get it properly repaired. Nor is it that weary as I'm getting and much as I carry when I travel the smaller size is not a distinct advantage. It is that the TC 40 has been a remarkable machine. It has had a simply fantastic amount of use and has been completely trouble-free. With fine quality tapes.

Some time ago you had given me Mark's caution against submineratures and had told me that Sony had withdrawn their earlier model. I guess I was just overwhelmed by a combination of factors, like the smaller one weighing more than the larger, the salesman's encouragement when the one I got was a loss leader and the demonstrator's fine performance, and faith in the Sony name... We can probably get a tape of the show, but I'm disappointed not to be able to make dubt without giving JL extra work to do or tok have to leave the phone uncovered. As I'll have to today because the Craig is not suitable located for the interview.

I have not yet seen The Washingtonian issue. As soon as I heard of the kind of story Goulden had written, having recollection enough on Truth Is the First Casualty to jump to a tentative conclusion, I read Superlawyers. You know what I spotted on first examination, confirmed by reading the whole thing. Discussed this with Lesar. He saw Goulden's book on foundations being remaindered, read it and lo! as I told him when he said he had read it: not a mention of the CIA and foundations. Lesar laughed and said more, not a single reference to the CIA. In a book written so long after public exposure?

The pattern is there. If it is less than 100% proof it is enough to make suspicion reasonable. Especially given the 100% inaccuracy of the original article and the total nonresponsiveness of the rejoinder. He did write 180° from what he knew to be true and this is not easily explained away in an experienced reporter who also flubbed the first major assassination story despite the best local contacts. Unless you consider his having written that LHO was FBI only when the original report was either FBI or CIA or both not flubbing.

It comes at a good time. We'll be able to depose him in time. And others.

If you wonder at the kind of letter I wrote WTTG, I'll explain a little further. They know me well and have shunned me, despite any current news, since early 1967. They would not air O in NO on appearance or F-U. They did not come to me initially this time. They were deparate because Franklin refused to appear, they wanted to air the subject (the station is controlled by one of the signers of one of Colson's fake ads) and they did not want Harris alone in this effort to puff up the sainted J. Edgar. So, they went to Bud, who this time had the good sense to beg off and did the surprising, referred them to me. It is I who suggested Willens to them.

I have never taken time for personal publicity, have never sought any, and don't recall any not connected with a book. So, I said the only way I'd appear is if they'd meet the special needs of a book not in commercial distribution and do what could prevent the time from being a futility for me and the audience. They agreed and did not tell me they changed their minds until I was there.

While I feel I did much good on the show (the staff was tickled) but for the kind of show I gave them rather than the content), if they are not going to come to me when I ~~am~~ am at least the area's unquestioned expert on the subject and then screw me on a deal like this, their good will means nothing to me but the chance that they'll keep their word on another occasion can mean something. Or, I'd rather not do anything on their air under the conditions of the Thursday show. And there is always the off chance that consciences can be pricked.

The one letter I've gotten is apparently paranoid and from one who knew me from my books. The reaction from those who know me and got to see the show is uniformly good.

There is also the question of self-respect as distinguished from ego. Why would have kept me silent in return for the exposure.

We'll see if there is anything that can come of it.

Waldron hopes to come here weekend 3/8, to confirm 3/7 if he can from varied assignments, including Southwestern Bell. Ref McKinley letter and possible story. Told him of Times London/Copeland piece and he'll speak to Sy Herish. (His hangup on me is more than just a prejudice on the subject, on which he has often spoken to huts.) He used to be represented by the man who now reps. Woodstein. They have much to lomsenow, all three. Waldron spotted error in McRae's decision on the surveillance. Incidentally, JL says even Paul Valentine is disturbed about some aspects. Having read the whole thing now, JL says it is the worst yet and much worse than the stories had indicated. The error in fact and quotation is gross and can't be accidental. PV agreed on those things JL spotted in skimming PV's copy. Ours have not come yet. The decision lends itself to the approach I've suggested and JL agrees with it. I'm pushing him on filing more motions on which he can appeal separately to 6th circuit and to make direct confrontation with judge and and between him and 6th circuit, not to depend on their finding his decision repugnant. Now that all my political reasoning of the past is validated, I hope they listen. Best